

6. *Cantharis pellucida* Fr. var. nova **Rauterbergi**.

*Nigra, capite, vertice nigro excepto, prothorace supra subtusque, antennis pedibusque totis, mesosterno abdomineque laete rufo-testaceis.*

Durch ganz hell gefärbte Beine und gelbrothen Bauch abweichend. Von *longicollis*, mit welcher diese Form in der Färbung übereinstimmt, durch den gerundeten kürzeren Thorax verschieden.

Von Herrn Oberlehrer A. Rauterberg im nördlichen Oldenburg in einiger Anzahl gesammelt.

## Rejoinder to Dr. Bergroth and Mr. Distant.

By **W. F. Kirby**, F. L. S., F. E. S. etc.

I am sorry to have to trouble the readers of the "Wiener Entomologische Zeitung" with this rejoinder, but I find that there are still a few points which appear to require further explanation.

The accusation of placing Cinghalese species in American genera resolves itself into a mere repetition of the main charge of having found it convenient to use Walker's arrangement in my paper: for Walker (List of Homopterous Insects vol. VIII, p. 135) treats *Polididus* as a section of *Zelus*.

As I never edited the Orthoptera for the Zoological Record, as Dr. Bergroth seems to suppose, his footnote on p. 70 (antea) has nothing to do with me. The reference, which he has omitted, is evidently to Zool. Record, vol. XI (1874), p. 458.

I do not hold a brief for Walker; but may quote Mr. McLachlan's opinion of his work:

"Like all the other Catalogues by this author, [the second part of his list of Neuropterous insects] shows an immense amount of bibliographical research, and as a compilation is very valuable; but like them also, it proves the author's incapacity for discriminating species or groups, and as a consequence, many of his names sink as synonyms of his own or previously described species. The descriptions are generally good, often excellent, but there is no appreciation of affinities, and the whole work bears the impress of mechanical effort."

(“Journal of the Linnean Society of London”, Zoology, vol. XI, p. 220.)

This is the language of fair and honest criticism, but not of senseless and unqualified condemnation.

In citing *Piatypleura strumosa*, I did not complain of Stål for changing his opinions, but for making contradictory statements in different works, without a word of explanation.

It will probably be enough to quote a single instance in confirmation of my statement that “Stål’s species are constantly quoted with doubt by those who have not examined his types”.

*Heterogamia pilifera* Stål.

„La diagnose donnée par M. Stål est très-succincte, et je suis dans le doute si cette espèce n'est pas identique à la *Derocalymma versicolor* Burm.“ Brunner von Wattenwyl, Nouv. Syst. des Blattaires, p. 353.

Mr. Distant is so strongly prejudiced in favour of Stål, that though he cannot shut his eyes to those of Stål’s numerous errors which he happens to discover, he sometimes thinks it necessary to apologise for them on the ground of his usual accuracy (!).

“Stål, by an error unusual with that excellent worker and describer, wrote that the *Dundubia saturata* Walk. . . . was a synonym of *Cicada flavida*.” (Monograph of Oriental Cicadidae, p. 52.)

Nevertheless Mr. Distant is forced sometimes to express himself in very similar language to what I have employed, respecting Stål’s work on the Homoptera. Indeed it is likely that my remarks (Wiener Ent. Ztg., XI, pag. 301, 302) were written under a vague recollection of the first passage that I am about to quote:

“Had Stål lived, he would doubtless have catalogued the Homoptera with his usual lucidity and thoroughness. It becomes, however, both a puzzle and waste of time to attempt to unravel the many genera he founded in this family either without specifying types, or alluding to such subsequently, in other publications of a miscellaneous character . . . In 1862 Stål proposed the genus *Cyrpopotus*, in which he sank his previously described genus *Amycle* as a section — a course of

nomenclature which ought not to be followed." (*Biologia Centrali-Americana*, Homoptera, pp. 25, 26.)

"I have found it absolutely impossible to determine whether (*Domitia obscura* Dist., n. sp.) may not belong to some other genus of Stål, of which the description is contained only in a 'Conspectus generum', without the type being given, or when given, referable to some described but unfigured species originally referred to another genus. As remarked before, owing to the premature death of Stål, his Homopteral work is in a somewhat confused and unravelled condition, and is in striking contrast to the Heteropteral work, which is thoroughly digested and elaborated." (*Biologia*, p. 33.)

"Stål (*Hem. Afr.* IV, p. 27) recites *Tibicen maculicollis* as a synonym of *T. brunneus* Fabr. a species found in the island of Mauritius. This is incorrect and the two species belong to different subgenera as defined by Stål himself: *T. brunneus* belonging to the s. g. *Abrieta* and *T. maculicollis* to the s. g. *Abroma*." (*Orient. Cic.*, p. 131.)

After such admissions, and my previous exposure of some of Stål's numerous inaccuracies, let us hear no more of the transcendent merits of Stål, as contrasted with the atrocious blunders of Walker. Speaking for myself only, I must repeat that I regard Walker's errors and bad work as of a far less mischievous character than Stål's, on account of the pseudo-authoritative style assumed by the latter.

I will now try to further elucidate some of the *Cicadidae* mentioned by Mr. Distant.

*Cicada bimaculata* Oliv.

This is the species which Stål identifies with *C. viridis* Fabr., and it agrees fairly with the Fabrician description; but as Fabricius quoted a figure of a Surinam insect (Stoll, fig. 100), and gave the locality as South America, I prefer to call the Javanese species by Olivier's name, until it has been proved that there is no South American species agreeing with Fabricius' description. *C. bimaculata* is figured by Stoll (fig. 132) and is undoubtedly identical with *C. atrovirens* Guérin, also described from Java. Unfortunately there is only a single female specimen (from Java) in the British Museum at present; but this agrees very well with Stoll's figure, except in being

slightly smaller, and in wanting the white pulverulent spots on the abdomen. I append a few salient points of difference between *C. bimaculata* and *C. mixta*.

	<i>C. bimaculata.</i>	<i>C. mixta.</i>
Exp. tegm.:	73—80 mm.	97—111 mm.
Locality:	Java.	Ceylon.
Face:	Yellow, below level of vertex.	Black, marked with red along the central line; and some of the lateral ridges reddish.
Anterior lobe of pronotum:	Green, sutures narrowly black.	Black, with a short reddish dash in the middle.
Mesonotum:	Olivaceous, with black markings.	Black, with only the edges, and two central securiform stripes tawny.

As I have given a lengthy description of *C. mixta* elsewhere, I need not pursue the subject further. The sexes differ little.

The insect which Mr. Distant describes and figures as *C. viridis*, is, I presume, from the Philippine Islands, and appears to differ so much from the two species of which I have been speaking that I expect it will prove to be a third species, at present in want of a name.

#### *Terpnosia Psecas* Walk.

The British Museum possesses several specimens closely allied to this species some of which were formerly associated with *T. Psecas* in the collection, but whether by Walker himself, I cannot say. It would be useless to compare them, because the males and females all come from different localities. The only specimen which appears to me specifically identical with the type of *T. Psecas*, from Java is one recently acquired from Borneo. This also is a female. When I see males from Java agreeing with those from Ceylon, or females from Ceylon agreeing with the type from Java, I will admit the identity of *T. Psecas* Walk. and *T. elegans* Kirb. But I may say that the true *T. Psecas* is a reddish-brown insect, very different from the greenish females from Siam, which approach *T. elegans* most nearly.

#### *Pomponia Greeni* Kirb.

Concerning this insect I remarked, "Possibly allied to *P. Ranssoneti* Dist., also from Ceylon, but which I only know

from the description. *P. Ransonneti*, however, seems to be a much larger insect, and less brightly coloured".

I have already admitted the probable identity of these species; and as I cannot be held responsible for Mr. Distant's misprints I am surprised at his having thought it necessary to refer to the species again.

*Tibicen apicalis* Kirb.

I have nothing to add respecting this species to what I have said before.

No one is infallible, and even Owen and Westwood are admitted to have committed greater errors than any alleged against me; and it is only the mischief caused by the undue adulation of some authors and the equally unreasonable depreciation of others, that has led me to write as I have done respecting Walker and Stål.

"Those who live in glass houses should not throw stones", and although Mr. Distant may have worked at the Rhynchota for years, the fact does not confer on him any immunity from error.

I would therefore advise Dr. Bergroth to be a little more careful of the accuracy of his statements in future; and would also urge on Mr. Distant much greater caution than he has hitherto displayed, in his identifications of the species of both ancient and modern authors.

Is he sure that he really knows anything at all about the true *Cicada viridis*, *C. bimaculata* or *C. Psecas*? Before assuming that the localities given by old authors are necessarily wrong. I always think it advisable to search for an insect to fit the description or figure from the actual locality given; — and I often find it.

I never object to fair criticism, but I must protest strongly against the tone which both Dr. Bergroth and Mr. Distant have assumed towards me; and I much regret that courtesy and fair play are so often absent among Entomologists.

I note the following errata in my former communication: Wien. Ent. Ztg. 1893, p. 303, line 19 for „cosisting“ read „consisting“, p. 304, line 10 from bottom, for „curelessness“ read „carelessness“.